

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

RECEIVED
USDC, CLERK, CHARLESTON, SC

2010 FEB 19 A 11:51

Tyrone Hillie,

Plaintiff,


v.

Warden Stan Burt; Warden McKeither
Bodison; Lt. Smith; Lt. Miller; Grievance
Clerk Jenkins; Grievance Clerk Hardin;
Classification Clerk Ms. Odom;
Classification Clerk Ms. Rembert; Dr.
Robert Babb; Head Nurse Powell; Food
Supervisor Reeves; Food Supervisor
Deloch; Food Supervisor Felder; and
Food Supervisor Ms. Myers, sued in
their individual capacities,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 0:09-1422-SB

ORDER



The Plaintiff, proceeding pro se filed the above-captioned matter pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. By local rule, the matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge for preliminary determinations, and on January 28, 2010, Magistrate Judge Paige J. Gossett issued a report and recommendation ("R&R") analyzing the Plaintiff's motion for an injunction (Entry 12) and recommending that the Court deny the motion. Attached to the R&R was a notice advising the Plaintiff of the right to file specific, written objections to the R&R within 10 days of the date of service of the R&R. To date, no objections have been filed.

Absent timely objection from a dissatisfied party, a district court is not required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, a Magistrate Judge's factual or legal conclusions. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985); Wells v. Shriners Hosp., 109 F.3d

198, 201 (4th Cir. 1997). Here, because the Plaintiff did not file any specific, written objections, there are no portions of the R&R to which the Court must conduct a de novo review. Accordingly, after review, the Court hereby adopts the Magistrate Judge's R&R as the Order of this Court, and it is

ORDERED that the Plaintiff's motion for an injunction (Entry 12) is denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



The Honorable Sol Platt, Jr.
Senior United States District Judge

February 18, 2010
Charleston, South Carolina

